

REMARKS

This application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office Action dated May 18, 2005. Claims 1-10 remain pending in this application. Claims 1 and 9 are the independent claims. Favorable reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Applicant notes with appreciation the indication that Claims 3-6 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all the limitations of their respective base claims and any intervening claims. Applicant respectfully refrains from so amending Claims 3-6 at this time because they believe their respective base claims to be allowable.

In response to the Office Action's objection to the drawings, Applicant respectfully believes the amendments to the specification adequately respond to the objection and respectfully requests its withdrawal.

In response to the Office Action's objection to the specification for failing to provide subtitles, Applicant gratefully acknowledges the Office Action's suggestion, however respectfully declines to add the headings as they are not required in accordance with MPEP §608.01(a).

On the merits, the Office Action rejected Claim 8 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to

point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Applicant respectfully believes the amendments to Claim 8 render the rejection moot and requests its withdrawal.

Further on the merits, the Office Action rejected Claims 1-2, 7, 9, and 10 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Jaspers et al. (WO 99/04555; hereinafter "Jaspers"). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection for at least the following reasons.

Jaspers fails to recite or suggest a clipping device for clipping the sensor output signal or the plurality of color signal values. Rather, Jaspers recites white balance control circuit WBC receiving inputs from a processor. (See, e.g., page 13, lines 18-30) Therefore Jaspers fails to recite a clipping device for clipping the sensor output signal. Additionally, Jasper's WBC only receives signal inputs for colors on which no smart algorithm is used. The WBC circuit balances the R and B colors against, for example a smartGreen to achieve a certain white threshold and generates R" and B" signals. After which the smartGreen, R", and B" signals are fed into a false color killer circuit FCK' to correct chrominance signals and luminance signals. (See, e.g., page 13, lines 18-30) Therefore, Jaspers fails to recite or

suggest a clipping device for clipping the plurality of color signal values generated from a reconstruction unit.

Thus Jaspers fails to recite or suggest every element of Applicant's Claim 1. Applicant respectfully traverses the § 102(b) rejection over Jaspers for at least these reasons.

Claim 9 recites a method substantially corresponding to the signal processing device of Claim 1 and is believed patentable for at least the same reasons.

Claims 2, 7, and 10 depend from one or another of the independent claims discussed above and are believed patentable for at least the same reasons. In addition, Applicant believes Claims 2, 7, and 10 to be independently patentable and requests separate consideration of each claim.

In view of the foregoing remarks, Applicant respectfully requests favorable reconsideration and early passage to issue of the present application. Applicant's undersigned attorney may be reached by telephone at the number given below.

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Aaron Waxler

Reg. 48,027

(914) 333-9608

August 18, 2005